

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/775,930	Applicant(s) SUGAWARA ET AL.	
	Examiner A. Dexter Tugbang	Art Unit 3729	

All Participants:

- (1) A. Dexter Tugbang, Examiner.
 (2) David R. Metzger, for Applicant(s).

Status of Application: _____

- (3) _____
 (4) _____

Date of Interview: 18 July 2007

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Those applied in the last Office Action (Non-Final, mailed on February 23, 2007)

Claims discussed:

Claims 7 through 12

Prior art documents discussed:

Honda et al (U. S. Patent 5,708,543)


Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


A. DEXTER TUGBANG
PRIMARY EXAMINER

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

The examiner noted to the applicant(s) that the amendment filed on April 26, 2007 did not overcome the prior art rejection as applied in the last Office Action. However, the examiner proposed an amendment to Claim 7 to overcome the prior art (see attached Examiner's Amendment). Mainly adding the feature of "track width regulating grooves" to Claim 7 would now overcome the Honda et al reference.

Furthermore, the examiner suggested changing the recitations of a "nonmagnetic gap" to a --magnetic gap--, to agree with the specification. The specification (p. 10) specifically recites a "magnetic gap" (e.g. 2 in Fig. 1) and by changing the claims, this would allow the claims to agree with the specification.

The changes suggested by the examiner to Claims 8, 9 and 12 were to correct mere informalities with grammar and do not affect the scope of the claimed invention. The changes were agreed to by the applicant(s), which places the application in condition for allowance..